



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,190	08/31/2004	Jaakko Itavaara	005288.00171	5189
22907 7590 04/29/2008 BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD. 1100 13th STREET, N.W. SUITE 1200 WASHINGTON, DC 20005-4051				
EXAMINER				
TRAN, MYLINH T				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2179				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/29/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/711,190

Applicant(s)

ITAVAARA ET AL.

Examiner

MYLINH TRAN

Art Unit

2179

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 January 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-14 and 16-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-14, 16-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's Amendment filed 01/08/08 has been entered and carefully considered. Claims 1, 6, 9, 10-14, 16-20 have been amended. Claims 21-26 have been added. However, the limitations of the amended claims and new claims have not been found to be patentable over prior art of record, therefore, claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-26 are rejected under the same ground of rejection as set forth in the Office Action mailed 10/17/07.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-26 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-

22 of U.S. Patent No. 6,832,353. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they both teach the features of "mapping each of the plurality of sections of the web page to at least one button of a plurality of buttons on the keypad, detecting that a user of the small-screen device has selected one of the plurality of buttons on the keypad and in response to the above step, displaying on the display the section of the web page mapped to the selected button".

As per claims 1 and 11, 21 and 24, claims 1, 11, 21 and 24 of the present application 10/711,190 claim the same subject matter as claims 1 and 2 of the Patent No. 6,832,353 except that:

The present application 10/711,190 discloses "mapping each of a plurality of sections of the web page to at least one button of a plurality of buttons on a keypad of the small-screen device." while the Patent No. 6,832,353 discloses "web page information associates each section of the web page to one or more selectable elements on the small screen device."

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use the teaching from the Patent of "associating each section of the web page to one or more selectable elements on the small screen device" to map each of a plurality of sections of the web page to at least one button of a plurality of buttons

on a keypad of the small-screen device" since it would have been one or more selectable elements to become one or more buttons.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use the teaching from the Patent of "one or more selectable elements on the small screen device." to create "one or more button of a plurality of buttons on a keypad of the small-screen device." since it would have been to achieve a same result when associating the web sections to the buttons or mapping the web sections to the buttons.

As per claims 1 and 11, 21 and 24, claims 1, 11, 21 and 24 of the present application 10/711,190 claim the same subject matter as claims 3 and 13 of the Patent No. 6,832,353. Both the Patent and the present application disclose the feature of "mapping each of the plurality of sections of the web page to at least one button on the keypad."

As per claims 1, 11, 21 and 24, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teaching of "said mapping is based on preexisting logical divisions of the web page unrelated to the keypad mapping" to the Patent application. Motivation of the combination would have been for the user to select a correct content of the webpage based on a preexisting logical arrangement/division of the webpage.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 3-4, 6-11, 13-14 and 16-26 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Herigstad et al. [US.
2004/0174400].

As to claims 1 and 11, Herigstad et al. teach receiving at a small-screen device, a web page for display on a display of the small-screen device (figure 2A); mapping each of a plurality of sections of the web page to at least one button of a plurality of buttons on a keypad of the small-screen device (page 1, 0004), based at least in part on a position of each section within the web page as compared to the position of the at least one button to which it is mapped within the keypad (page 1, 0005); wherein said mapping is based on preexisting logical divisions of the web page unrelated to the keypad mapping (0009-0010); detecting that a user of the small-screen device has selected one of the plurality of buttons on the keypad (page 1, 0007); in response to detecting that a user of the small-screen device having selected one of the plurality of

buttons on the keypad, displaying on the display only the section of the web page mapped to the selected button (figure 2A).

As to claims 3 and 13, Herigstad et al. teach each section corresponding to a frame within the web page (figure 2A).

As to claims 4 and 14, Herigstad et al. also teach one of the sections corresponding to a table within the web page (page 3, 0036-0037).

As to claims 6 and 16, Herigstad et al. teach identifying a predetermined number of subsections of the one section (page 1, 0005), the predetermined number of subsections corresponding to the number of buttons to which the one section is mapped; and mapping each of the plurality of subsections of the one section to different ones of the buttons to which the one section is mapped (page 3, 0035); based at least in part on a position of each subsection within the one section as compared to the position of the buttons to which the one section is mapped (page 1, 0006-0008, and wherein the displaying comprises displaying on the display the subsection of the web page mapped to the selected button (figure 2A)

As to claims 7 and 17, Herigstad et al. also teach the displaying on the display comprising displaying an icon indicating which section of the web page is presently displayed (figure 2A).

As to claims 8 and 18, Herigstad et al. teach the icon comprising a sectional representation of the web page (figure 8).

As to claims 9 and 19, Herigstad et al. teach prior to the detecting that a user of the small-screen device having selected one of the plurality of buttons on the keypad, displaying a mapping screen indicating to the user of the small-screen device the mappings between sections and buttons (figure 8).

As to claims 10 and 20, Herigstad et al. teach the displaying on the display comprising displaying an icon indicating which section of the web page is presently displayed, and wherein the icon comprises a miniature representation of the mapping screen (figure 8).

As to claims 21 and 24, Herigstad et al. teach a processor; and memory storing computer readable instructions that, when executed by the processor, cause the apparatus to serve a web page for display on a small screen device wherein the web page has been divided into a plurality of sections (0007-0010), said computer readable instructions comprising:

mapping each of the plurality of sections of the web page to at least one button on a keypad comprising a plurality of buttons (0004), based at least in part on a position of each section within the web page as compared to the position of the at least one button to which it is mapped within the keypad (0005), wherein said mapping is based on preexisting logical divisions of the web page unrelated to the keypad mapping (0007-0010);

receiving user input comprising a selection of one of the plurality of buttons on the keypad (0004, "The visual information represents a selection option that a user may select by pressing the key that is associated with the region."), wherein said user input is received from a mobile terminal corresponding to the user; and responsive to receiving the user input, sending to the mobile terminal the section of the web page mapped to the selected button (0004, "Once the key is selected, an event ,au be triggered that is appropriate for the chosen option.")

As to claims 22 and 25, Herigstad et al. teach each section corresponding to a frame within the web page (figure 2A, 42).

As to claims 23 and 26, Herigstad et al. teach sending to the mobile terminal an icon for display on the mobile terminal, said icon indicating which section of the web page is presently displayed (figure 8, 30).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 2 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Herigstad et al. [US. 2004/0174400] in view of Hawkins et al. [US. 6,516,202].

As to claims 2 and 12, Herigstad et al. fail to clearly teach the keypad comprising a 12-key telephone keypad. However, in the same field of the invention, the claimed limitation is disclosed by Hawkins et al. at figure 8a, column 2, lines 44-64. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine Hawkins's of teaching of comprising a 12-key telephone keypad with the teaching of Herigstad et al.

Art Unit: 2179

Motivation of the combination would have been for the advantage of reliability, simplicity of an input device.

Response to Arguments

Applicant has also argued that Herigstad does not teach or suggest the feature of "said mapping is based on preexisting logical divisions of the web page unrelated to the keypad mapping." However, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant's attention is directed to paragraph 0010 which cited "a first map of a geographic area is displayed on a display of an electronic device. The first map contains a site that a party wishes to locate. The map is partitioned into visually delimited regions and each region corresponds to a respective one of the numbered keys." It is clear that dividing the first map of the geographic area on the basis of preexisting logical divisions unrelated to the mapping process.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mylinh Tran. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thu from 7:00AM to 3:00PM at 571-272-4141.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo, can be reached at 571-272-4847.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

571-273-8300

Art Unit: 2179

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mylinh Tran

Art Unit 2179

/Weilun Lo/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2179